

completed a course at the Bangor Theological Seminary in 1855. He married that year and served as professor of rhetoric, oratory, and modern languages at Bowdoin.

In 1862, he was granted a leave of absence to study abroad but he abandoned this plan and enlisted as lieutenant colonel of the 20th Maine. He remained in active service until the end of the Civil War, taking part in 24 battles including Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, Spottsylvania, Cold Harbor, Petersburg, and Five Forks. He was wounded six times, once almost fatally at Petersburg. He was made a brigadier general on the field by Gen. Ulysses S. Grant.

Chamberlain returned briefly to his academic duties at Bowdoin, but was soon elected Governor of Maine, a position he served with great distinction for four terms. He helped to establish the new agricultural and technical college at Orono which eventually grew into the University of Maine.

In 1871 he returned to Bowdoin to serve as president while also lecturing on mental and moral philosophy, political science, and public law. He died in Portland in 1914 at the age of 85.

The Civil War, comments historian Geoffrey Ward, "was a war that thrust figures of common clay into monuments of true grandeur." How well the actions of Joshua Chamberlain affirm this observation. He was a man inspired to greatness by the cause he served. I hope my colleagues will work with me in passing this legislation as a means of paying tribute to the many years of outstanding service Joshua Chamberlain gave to the State of Maine and the country.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague Senator Bill COHEN in sponsoring legislation to name the U.S. Post Office in Brewer, ME, in honor of Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain. Chamberlain, who was born in Brewer on September 8, 1828, and grew up there, went on to play an important role in the history of Maine and the United States.

Historians will recognize the name of Joshua Chamberlain, whose remarkable military career placed him at some of the most critical battles of the Civil War. At the Battle of Gettysburg, Colonel Chamberlain commanded the 20th Maine Infantry Regiment which held down the extreme left flank of the Union line. Chamberlain and his regiment defended Little Round Top until their ammunition ran out, at which point he ordered "fix bayonets" and led an unexpected charge down the hill capturing nearly 400 Confederate prisoners. Chamberlain's leadership is credited with contributing significantly to the North's victory at the pivotal Battle of Gettysburg.

During the Civil War, Chamberlain commanded troops in 24 battles as well as numerous skirmishes. He was wounded six times and was promoted to general on the battlefield by Gen.

U.S. Grant. At the war's end, General Chamberlain was given the honor of receiving the Southern Surrender at Appomattox Court House, ordering his own troops to stand at attention and salute the defeated Army of Northern Virginia. General Chamberlain was given the honor of first place in the last Grand Review in Washington following the Civil War.

Mr. President, the extraordinary public service of Joshua Chamberlain did not end with the Civil War. After he returned to Maine following his military career, Chamberlain was elected Governor by the largest majority in the State's history. He was subsequently reelected three times.

The people of Brewer and Maine are rightfully proud of their distinguished native son. The Brewer City Council and the Brewer-Orrington Customer Advisory Council have both requested that the memory of Joshua Chamberlain be honored by naming the U.S. Post Office in Brewer after him. This is a fitting tribute to an outstanding American.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2153) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF JOSHUA LAWRENCE CHAMBERLAIN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The United States Post Office building located at 22 Parkway South, Brewer, Maine, shall be known and designated as the "Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain Post Office Building".

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morn-

ing business for a period up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are now in the final hours, it appears, of the process of wrapping up this session of Congress and putting together an omnibus appropriations bill, which I understand late last night was agreed to between the White House and the Congress.

I want to talk a little bit about this process and specifically about sections of that bill which I have responsibility for, or had responsibility for as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and State.

I have to say, I was startled by the manner in which these proceedings went forward. I was discouraged. The taxpayers, to put it quite simply, have been fleeced. It is beyond my most pessimistic anticipations that the events that occurred in the spending of taxpayers' dollars over the last few days would have occurred under a Republican Congress. I can understand that they have occurred under a liberal Presidency, a Democratic Presidency, but to have them occur under a Republican Congress is, I think, a sad and trying day for the American taxpayer who has traditionally looked to the Republicans for fiscal responsibility.

The budget, as it was proposed by the Republican Congress, basically flat funded discretionary spending accounts of the United States for the next year. We were, however, put in the very difficult position—and the blame does not really lie with the Congress here; it lies with the Presidency—we were put, I should say are put, in the very difficult position by the President that if we did not spend a heck of a lot more money in a heck of a lot of other accounts, he would veto the proposals of our Congress. The Congress had put together proposals, the purpose of which was to institute financial responsibility.

You have to understand that not only ourselves, but especially our children will be facing a nation which will end up being fiscally bankrupt if we do not undertake some responsibility.

We have been spending more money than we have been taking in for a long period of time. Although the number is going down, the fact is, it still is a considerable number, over \$100 billion of deficit this year, and as we move into the outer years here, as we move into the year 2000 and beyond, it goes back rather sharply.

So the need for fiscal responsibility has not left, or should not have left, the agenda of American Government. Yet, the White House told us that if we did not spend a great deal more money in a number of accounts which they were interested in, that they would veto the bills and they would force us into a shutdown of the Government.

The leadership of the Congress, appreciating the fact that the last time the Government was shut down—the Congress came out with a pretty black eye—decided to try to accommodate the White House. Every time a decision was made to accommodate the White House and the administration, more money was demanded. It became a process of goal posts moving, which has become the term around here that most adequately describes how this spending has occurred. But what it has meant is basically a geometric progression, the spending of which the American taxpayers have to bear.

Some of these accounts which the White House has asked to spend money on are just classic liberal, profligate spending undertakings, and they are dollars which the American people, if they knew about them, if they were put in the context of disclosure, simply would not accept that type of spending.

Some of those accounts, unfortunately, were in categories which were under my auspices with the Commerce, Justice, and State Subcommittee, and I want to discuss a few of them because I think they should at least be on the record as to what has happened here, how American tax dollars are being spent by this administration. This is the most liberal administration that I have ever seen during my term in Government.

You know, this President wanders around the countryside talking as a moderate, but the simple fact is that this administration is governing on the far left of the spending when it comes to spending American tax dollars. Let me cite a few examples that I think confirm this.

Let us begin with the United Nations. In the bill which we proposed, which Congress proposed, we had limited the amount of spending to the United Nations. We had decided that we would not pay what is known as arrearages in peacekeeping and we would not pay what is known as arrearages to the various international organizations.

Why? Because the United Nations is an institution that is penetrated throughout with patronage. It is an institution which has wasted millions and millions of dollars, and every dollar that is wasted at the United Nations, every time some friend of some friend or some cousin of some leader from some country is hired by the United Nations to fill a nonexistent job or a job that is basically nonfunctional at some outrageous pay level, every time that occurs, 25 percent of the dollars spent on that individual come out of an American taxpayers's wallet. The record is replete with abuses and with mismanagement and with waste which has become the character of the United Nations management.

The average U.N. salary for a mid-level accountant is \$84,000—\$84,000 for a mid-level accountant. That same person living in New York City working for a non-United Nations entity would be paid on the average \$41,000. Twice as

much is paid to the U.N. individual, plus they do not pay taxes. The man or woman who is working in New York City has to pay taxes.

The average U.N. computer analysis person receives \$111,000 tax free—\$111,000. The average American doing that same job, and probably does a lot better job and I bet works a lot more hours, gets \$56,000.

An assistant to the Secretary-General, of which there are innumerable, gets \$190,000. That is \$60,000 more than we pay the Mayor of New York who actually works for a living.

The fact is that this institution is mismanaged and is dominated by patronage.

Now the administration wants us to spend an extra \$225 million to pay back fees, back payments and to pay operating costs so that we can reimburse them for this mismanagement and we can fund this mismanagement out into the future.

In order to try to get some hold on this, the Congress said to the administration, well, before we are going to pay anything more of any significance, we want a certification that the United Nations is living within the agreement which was reached as a result of the pressure put on it by us that it would have a no-growth budget.

In an act of a very serious—I think very serious—question of integrity, we have now received such a certification that the United Nations has a zero-growth budget. Well, that is impossible because the United Nations is already over its budget. We know it is over its budget. It is over its budget, by our estimates, by over \$100 million. Yet, we received this certification from the administration. So you have to even question the atmosphere in which this administration is functioning relative to the United Nations.

It appears they are willing not only to throw money at it, but they are willing to stand up for their dishonesty within the United Nations. They are willing to stand up for the mismanagement within the United Nations. They are willing to stand up for the patronage within the United Nations at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Then, of course, we also know that this administration, on a number of occasions, has expressed their willingness to have American troops fight under the command of the United Nations, which is a mistake in and of itself. What is more classically liberal—what is more classically liberal—than funding an agency like the United Nations at an excessive level?

I do not argue with the need to have the United Nations. I happen to think the United Nations makes a great deal of sense. My disagreement here goes to the fact that we are essentially paying for its mismanagement, gross mismanagement, and that we are doing it with blinders on. This administration takes the attitude that anything that is a world community exercise, the United States taxpayers should pay for it, and pay dearly for it.

When they came to us after we had raised the level of reimbursement to the United Nations to a level which I felt was unacceptable—but I went along with the House—the administration came back and said that we were \$220 million short—\$220 million short—of what they wanted for the United Nations. In fact on my bill, they said we are a half a billion short, let us throw another half billion dollars into these programs. Why? Because they knew they had the Congress between a rock and a hard place.

They wanted to fund all their favorite little interest groups, in this case, interest groups within the international community, different international organizations, some of which are only marginal in their worth. They wanted to fund all these little different interest groups, and they knew they could do it because they recognized they had won the last battle about closing the Government down, and now they figured, well, the Congress is going to have to fold on all these issues. And unfortunately we have.

So, out of the taxpayers' pocket-books and wallets in New Hampshire and Arizona, hard-earned dollars—people working 40, 50 hours a week trying to make mortgage payments, trying to send their kids to school, having to pay their taxes now at a rate barely as high as a result of the tax increase under the first 2 years of this administration—those dollars are now going to fund John Jones, I suspect the person's name is not John Jones, some name I probably could not pronounce, from some country because John Jones had a cousin in the government who could get him a job at the United Nations where he would get paid x thousands of dollars more than an American doing the same job, and the person does not even have to show up to work.

In fact, ironically, one of the reforms we asked for and which was put in at the United Nations was a turnstile. We ask for a turnstile so we could figure out who was going to work. It turns out the returns were so bad that the United Nations staff forced the administration to take the turnstile out because they did not want to have people keeping track whether they ever showed up for work.

The fact is the United Nations is an institution, is an institution that is good, relative to its purpose, but as a practical manner, the manner in which it practices, the manner in which it manages itself, and the manner in which it spends its money is horrible. It is the American taxpayer that bears the burden, and the administration at the last minute, because they had the Congress by the throat, came in and said we need hundreds of millions—not hundreds, but \$200 million. That is a lot. In fact, we could run the State of New Hampshire for quite a while on \$200 million—more money to take care of their activities and to fund an agency which has not shown any fiscal discipline at all.

That is only one example of this liberal agenda which has caused the White House to come in here and dump all sorts of new dollars into different interest groups. This administration uses the Federal Treasury as its own little campaign financing mechanism. They used something called SCSEP (Senior Community Service Employment Program) to finance some of the most activist labor groups, and they use something called ATP to finance the friendships with the corporate world. ATP you probably have never heard of that. Well, it is something called the Advanced Technology Program where we go out and pick winners and losers in the technology communities—not with a lot of dollars, but we go out and we pick them. It is ironic who gets picked, ironic who gets picked.

The idea here was we would set up a pool of money and people with good ideas that could not get it funded in the private sector would be able to come to the Government and the Government would fund those ideas. That, in concept, is good, a good idea I suppose. If you happen to believe the Government should be in the business of deciding winners and losers in the marketplace and in the technology arena and there are certain technologies which the private sector is not going to fund, then it probably makes sense to do that.

I suspect there are some instances where a technology concept—remember, this is commercialization, this is not R&D. I should make that point. This is not R&D activity, but for items which will commercialize. We have literally billions of dollars committed to research, billions of dollars in all sorts of different accounts. This is purely an R&D, purely an applied research effort. The expectation is that almost all this will go to some sort of commercialization.

The argument was that the opportunity for return on these undertakings was so low or the likelihood of return was so low that nobody would fund them. First, that assumes that the marketplace cannot pick winners and losers in the technology field. That is a position that is hard to defend in America today where we see such an explosion of technology activity, literally billions and billions of dollars going into research which is applied and presumed going to go to commercialization, where we see billions and billions of dollars going into IPO's, where we see major corporations spending billions and billions of dollars on research. The concept that an idea which really has a commercial applicability, which has a potential, will not find a place to be funded, within the private sector is, I think, hard to argue, but that was the argument that was made.

So we set up this thing called the ATP. You would presume if that was the case, we are going to fund technology which has only a marginal like-

lihood of success, so marginal that the private sector is not willing to fund it, but has commercial applicability. You would think if that were the case, then the logical recipients of those funds would be small entrepreneurial efforts. That should be the case. Obviously, if someone cannot get funded, the odds are that they are a small entrepreneurial effort. You would not expect that General Motors, Ford, Exxon, AT&T, IBM, General Electric, the biggies, the international organizations, a few Japanese organizations, a few German organizations, you would not expect those types of companies would be in line for this type of a grant program.

In fact, I think, most Americans if they were told this type of program existed, would say, sure, Mary Mason down the road, who happened to be a brilliant computer person, should have a right to compete for that. But General Motors, are you kidding me—General Motors? I just bought a car from them and it was an outrageous price. They make tons of money.

This program has become a little piggy bank, a little cookie jar is a better term, a cookie jar into which the Fortune 500 companies stick their hands. This is the list of how the awards under this program went in 1994 and 1995. I will read down through the companies that received these awards because I think it is important, because it shows the nature of this program and what it is really being used for, which is to basically try to buy friendships in the business communities: General Motors, Ford, Exxon, AT&T, IBM, General Electric, Mobile, Chrysler, DuPont, Texaco, Chevron, Hewlett-Packard, Amoco, Motorola, Lockheed Martin, United Technologies, Dow Chemical, Boeing, Xerox, U.S. Steel, Bell South, 3M, Caterpillar—the list goes on. You get the idea. The fact is this program has become an outrage. It is corporate pork at its worst.

However, the administration comes in and says we must continue this program. You would think, listening to the administration, especially this President, that the Republican Party was the voice of corporate America. Well, it happened to be the Republican Senate which zeroed this program out, and it happens to be the Democratic liberal Presidency which wants to continue this program at excessive levels of funding—\$265 million was their demand for next year's funding of this program, \$265 million.

Now, why? Well, because, basically it takes care of their friends in the corporate community. It is a way for the Secretary of Commerce to be able to communicate. We have corporate America—send in a grant, we will send you some money; now, what do you want to talk about? It is done with the tax dollars of the American people and the American people should be outraged. It is classic liberal government, spending their money on programs that picks winners and losers in the marketplace, which goes to the Fortune 500

leadership, dollars which are scarce and which could be used much better by an American to go out and buy a product that was important to them and their family, or maybe help them go to school, or maybe help pay their mortgages, but instead this President wants to take those dollars out of your pocketbook and give them to these corporations to do things which obviously companies of this size, if they want to do it, they can do it. The idea that these companies need help in deciding their priorities on research and spending money on research is so absurd it should not even be discussed.

So it is not an argument for the substance of the program that generates this funding, because the substance cannot be defended. The only reason this funding exists is because under the liberal form of leadership which this administration represents they like to be able to pick winners and losers in the marketplace and they like to spend tax dollars.

Now, this bill overall that I had jurisdiction over until I was unceremoniously removed because I was too disruptive to the process, because I kept saying we should be concerned about our tax dollars, this bill spends \$500 million more. It does not spend it yet, that is what the administration wants, \$500 million more than what was offered to the administration, which happened to be \$1 billion more than what the bill was when it left this Senate Chamber.

It never left the Chamber. It never got out. When it left the Senate subcommittee that I chair, we were a billion dollars below our offer to the White House, as we brought up all these different accounts to try to satisfy the profligacy of the White House spending condition over some significant frustration of my own. And then the administration came in and said that is not enough. They wanted another \$500 million. I wish that that were all that were in this package, \$500 million. We could live with that. This is true across the board, in account after account. The administration came in and demanded massive more dollars in spending, and because they know that we have the Congress in a position basically where politically they have us by the throat, to be very honest, where they know that they have set up a scenario where if this Government is shut down, they feel they win politically and the American people will take their frustrations out on the Congress—that the Congressional leadership decided that they are going to allow the White House to get away with this raid on the American Treasury and, therefore, the American taxpayer.

I think it is a mistake, and I think we ought to take this issue to the American people. I think the American people will understand that there is a big difference between the shutdown that occurred a year ago and the desire of this administration to spend money

like it is water. The fact is that this President is now in the middle of a Presidential election. He is campaigning on the theme that he is a moderate. In fact, I heard AL GORE in New Hampshire call himself of a "fiscal conservative"—the Vice President of the United States. Well, this is not fiscal conservatism, spending this type of money. Spending \$220 million more on the United Nations so they can hire patronage is not fiscal conservatism. Picking winners and losers in the marketplace and having the winners be Fortune 500 companies, who can take care of themselves when it comes to R&D, is not fiscal conservatism. Spending \$6.5 billion more of the American taxpayers dollars and putting it, for all intents and purposes, on the deficit is not fiscal conservatism. It is liberalism. It is the classic situation where you buy votes with tax dollars and you spend money without regard to where it is going or how it is being accounted for, but only with regard to what the political pluses are from it. It comes back to roost—not to us, maybe, in our generation immediately, but certainly to our children, as they have to pay the bills.

It is a mistake. I felt it should be on the record from somebody, because nobody seems to want to talk about it around here. So I am taking these few minutes to make these points.

I yield back my time.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLITICAL GAMES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to tell you that I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire. Certainly, this needs to be talked about. I have never seen anything quite like what is happening to us here at the end of this session. The idea that those on the other side of the aisle, the administration and the Democrats, would hold up progress over the last 3 weeks, as they have, by having 100 amendments to every appropriations bill, most of them not at all attached to the subject, simply to hold it up to bring us up to the edge of this business of shutting down Government, which they found to be a great political advantage last year, is absurd.

I have never seen anything like this in my life. The Senator from New Hampshire is exactly right. They have extracted \$6.5 billion in additional spending simply by threatening—not on the merits of the spending—to close down the Government and blame the Republicans. I have never seen anything quite like that kind of deception—the idea that, for instance, talking about reducing the deficit and at the same time increasing deficit spending by \$5.5 billion, reduce the deficit

only by raising taxes—the largest tax increase we have ever had—and talk about reducing the numbers of employment when, in fact, almost all of it was as a result of base closures and civilian employees of DOD, and the end of the Resolution Trust Corporation, which had nothing to do with this President.

So that is where we are. I am just delighted that the Senator from New Hampshire, who has hands-on experience with this expenditure, as chairman of the subcommittee, has talked about where we are and where we need to go.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN SIMPSON

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to talk about a friend who will be leaving the Senate, a man whom I respect greatly, a man who—to quote a phrase he uses—is "a friend of his friends," and that is Senator Alan SIMPSON, from Wyoming, who will be retiring from the Senate at the end of this session.

AL SIMPSON is particularly close to me. He is from Cody, WY, a town of 10,000 or 12,000. Cody is also the same town I am from. We were both there last weekend at the Buffalo Bill Museum event.

AL is a lifelong friend, a good and gracious man. He comes from a family of good and gracious leadership. The first person that I remember as a kid, who was an outstanding citizen, one of those kinds that you remember, was Milward Simpson, AL's dad. Interestingly enough, the thing I remember the most was that he is the first guy I ever saw who could simply stand up and talk without being prepared, or without needing notes, and do it so eloquently. I guess that is where AL SIMPSON acquires his ability to do the same thing.

So many here in the Senate have known AL SIMPSON for a very long time, too, and are his friends. AL has been here for 18 years representing our State, battling for our State, battling for this country, and all of us feel so fortunate to have had him here. Some have mixed feelings about him leaving. On the one hand, all of us are happy that he and Ann will have an opportunity to do some other things. They have great interests, whether it be in museums, whether it be in health care, whether it be in the other historic things they have been interested in. But they have great grace and style in their personal relationships, and they will all be missed.

I have had the privilege of serving on the team from Wyoming with AL SIMPSON for the 5 years I was in the House, and these special 2 years, the last 2 years, I have been in the Senate. I suppose we have a unique closeness in our delegation from Wyoming. As everyone else does, we have two Members in the Senate, but we have just one in the House. There are just three of us. The people in Wyoming find it fairly easy to contact the delegation when they come, since there are just three of us.

We were talking yesterday about the population of Wyoming when I was presiding. There are about 470,000 people, and about 100,000 square miles for them to live. But in a State like that we become pretty personal in politics. We have an opportunity to talk. We have an opportunity to express the prejudices that each of us have, and ideas. It is truly unique. We have unique relationships. We have all been Republicans since I have been here. We have all been friends.

I have known ALAN virtually all my life. We lived basically up the street across the alley from the Simpson's in the wintertime. I knew him when he weighed 260 pounds, and had hair, and, as he says, thought beer was food. But fortunately Ann came along, and dressed him up. And he has been an outstanding representative of Wyoming since; frankly, not just of Wyoming. AL SIMPSON represents some of the best of this country; represents the kind of person who looks at an issue and takes the position that he believes is correct.

Clearly in this business there is a tendency to take the position that seems to be most popular. There is nothing unusual about that.

But AL SIMPSON has throughout his service here and in the Wyoming legislature been willing to take those positions that are not the most popular; that are not the easiest; that are not the road most traveled. And he has felt comfortable taking them.

I, particularly, will miss AL SIMPSON. We came from the same town, and the same university, since we only have one in Wyoming. We lived in the same athletic dorm, and now served in the same Senate.

So I have been around this guy a lot, and others will miss him too. He is a national figure.

He tells the story about a hotel in Cody where a lot of strangers come through, and someone coming up to him and saying—someone he did not know—"Did anyone ever tell you that you look like AL SIMPSON?" He said, "Yes. Sometimes." The man said, "It makes you mad, doesn't it?"

He is well known—well known because of his humor; the great skill and gift of humor that he has to make things seem a little lighter than they are. He says continuously and so properly, "You know, I take the issues seriously but I don't take myself seriously." We need more of that. We need more of that.

He is my political mentor and our senior Senator. I can tell you that Milward and Lorna, his parents, would be so proud. His father was a U.S. Senator as well as the Governor of our State, and president of the university and served on the board of trustees. AL and his brother have followed him in that great tradition of courage and class.

Let me just close by saying not only does he have great humor, great grace, and a great partner in Ann, but he is an extraordinary legislator. You can see